

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-9 are now present in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 8 and 9 have been added. Claim 1 is independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103

Claims 1-4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka, U.S. Patent No. 5,153,052. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Miller, U.S. Patent No. 5,160,105. Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Sutton, U.S. Patent No. 5,894,453. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. As the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements including "the elastic conical body being readily deformable", "the elastic conical body being without any protrusion extending above the connecting surface", "the connecting surface being at a top of the elastic conical body", "a top of the hollow portion being surrounded by an inner circumference of the connecting surface" and "the at least one elastic rib being readily

deformable". Applicants respectfully submit that the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1 is not disclosed nor suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

Tanaka discloses a double-shot molded resin article 1 including a primary molding part 3 having a hollow frame-like body portion 6 (see FIG. 2).

Tanaka teaches that the primary molding part 3 consists of a hard resin (see col. 2, lines 56-57). Therefore, Tanaka fails to teach "the elastic conical body being readily deformable" and "the at least one elastic rib being readily deformable" as recited in claim 1. To further clarify the present invention, Applicants respectfully submit that one of the present invention's primary purposes is to increase the elasticity of the foot pad so as to absorb the deformation of the object put on the foot pad. By using Tanaka's hard resin, the primary molding part 3 cannot be readily deformable to absorb the deformation of the object, which is the major drawback the present invention has overcome.

In addition, Tanaka also teaches leg portions 16 protruding from the rim of the primary molding part 3 to be inserted into the bottom panel of the appliance so that the double-shot molded resin article 1 can be fixed onto the appliance (see FIG. 2). Therefore, Tanaka fails to teach "the elastic conical body being without any protrusion extending above the connecting surface" as recited in claim 1. In addition, without the leg portions 16 protruding from the rim of the primary molding part 3, the

double-shot molded resin article 1 cannot be fixed onto the appliance. This would destroy the primary object of Tanaka.

With regard to the Examiner's reliance on Miller and Sutton, these references have only been relied on for their teachings related to the subject matter of dependent claims 5 and 7. In particular, Sutton teaches a foot 13 that has an annular ring 22 being at a bottom thereof (see FIG. 4). Sutton fails to teach "the connecting surface being at a top of the elastic conical body" and "a top of the hollow portion being surrounded by an inner circumference of the connecting surface". Miller teaches a foot device 10 that has a body portion 20 having an inner surface 21 and an outer surface 22 both extending axially on the body portion 20, and that the outer surface 22 comes in contact with the floor 60 (see col. 4, lines 16-18). Miller fails to teach "the connecting surface being at a top of the elastic conical body", "the hollow portion being surrounded by an inner surface of the elastic conical body" and "a top of the hollow portion being surrounded by an inner circumference of the connecting surface". Accordingly, these references also fail to disclose the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, these references fail to cure the deficiencies of Tanaka.

Accordingly, none of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claim 1 or its dependent claims. Therefore,

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims clearly define over the teachings of the references relied on by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are respectfully requested.

Additional Claim

Additional claims 8 and 9 have been added for the Examiner's consideration.

Claim 8 recites "the at least one elastic rib transversely crosses the entire hollow portion and contacts the inner surface of the elastic conical body". Tanaka discloses a pin slot for receiving the pin 15, a plurality of ribs connecting the pin slot and the hollow frame-like body portion 6 (see FIG. 2). The ribs of Tanaka are stopped by the pin slot and do not transversely cross the entire hollow frame-like body portion 6. Accordingly, Tanaka fails to teach the above recitation of claim 8. Sutton teaches a foot 13 with several fins 21 (see FIG. 4). However, the fins of Sutton do not transversely cross the entire foot 13. Miller also fails to teach the strips 24 transversely cross the entire foot device 10 (see FIG. 2). Accordingly, Miller and Sutton also fail to disclose the above recitation of claim 8.

Claim 9 recites "two ends of the at least one elastic rib contact the inner circumference of the connecting surface". As mentioned, the ribs of Tanaka only connect the pin slot and do not transversely cross the

hollow frame-like body portion 6. Only one end of each rib contacts the rim of the hollow frame-like body portion 6; the other end contacts the pin slot. Accordingly, Tanaka fails to teach the above recitation of claim 9. Likewise, Miller and Sutton also fail to disclose the above recitation of claim 9.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8 and 9 are allowable due to the additional recitation included in this claim, as well as due to its dependence on independent claim 1. Favorable consideration and allowance of additional claims 8 and 9 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state of the prior art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.


In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By


Joe McKinney Muncy
Reg. No. 32,334

KM/GH/mmi/asc
2019-0246PUS1



P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000